## Recommendations

- Align statewide crisis/disaster response threshold to local threshold:
- Replace " $5 \%$ of population" with "required languages and languages with a substantial number of LEP persons in San Francisco, as well as any additional languages in the district that are most spoken and have the highest rates of language access need."
- Refine requirement for translating Know Your Rights information:
- Replace " 20 most spoken languages in San Francisco" with " 20 languages in San Francisco that are most spoken and have the highest rates of language access need."
- Refine definition of "vital information" to include: "bills, fees, fines, penalties."
- Emphasize support for American Indian, Central and South American, and Oceanian languages.


## Key issues for consideration

- City information is shared most efficiently when we serve communities that have the highest rates of language access need, not just the most individual speakers.
- Departments should be encouraged to focus on communities with high percentages of limited English proficiency and linguistic isolation (a federal measure of households where no adult speaks English "very well"). Social service organizations have expressed that language access is a matter of "life and death" for these communities. See attachment for comparison.
- The new statewide language threshold for crisis/disaster response is less robust than the existing San Francisco language threshold.
- The new statewide requirement is " $5 \%$ of the population." At the citywide population level, this would include only Spanish and Chinese; at a district population level, this would include only Chinese in most districts, and no languages in others. See attachment for estimates by district.
- Language access for American Indian, Central and South American, and Oceanian communities is an important part of restoring their right to self-determination.
- In California, households that speak Indigenous languages have the highest rates of linguistic isolation (e.g., 53\% for Central and South American languages; 15\% for Native North American languages). However, the American Community Survey - the most frequently used source of language data - samples only a small number of people and undercounts these households in San Francisco. See attachment for California-wide estimates.
- The most impactful update to the ordinance is requiring departments to translate vital information into additional languages upon request.
- This amendment creates a pathway for everyone who lives, works, or attends school in San Francisco to receive vital information in their language.
- In contrast, changing the required language threshold from "10,000 LEP persons" to "6,000 LEP persons" would likely add only a single language - Vietnamese - because of the ongoing displacement of communities of color from San Francisco to the wider Bay Area.

| Most spoken languages |  |  |  |  | Most spoken languages AND highest rates of language access need |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Estimated total speakers in SF | \% in SF with limited proficiency |  |  |  | Estimated total speakers in SF | \% in SF with limited English proficiency |
| 1 | Spanish | 89,292 |  | 36\% | 1 | Khmer | 698 | 65\% |
| 2 | Cantonese | 66,461 |  | 62\% | 2 | Cantonese | 66,461 | 62\% |
| 3 | Chinese | 65,074 |  | 61\% | 3 | Mongolian | 391 | 61\% |
| 4 | Tagalog | 18,645 |  | 36\% | 4 | Chinese | 65,074 | 61\% |
| 5 | Mandarin | 14,661 |  | 38\% | 5 | Vietnamese | 11,285 | 60\% |
| 6 | Vietnamese | 11,285 |  | 60\% | 6 | Tigrinya | 356 | 56\% |
| 7 | Russian | 11,026 |  | 44\% | 7 | Hungarian | 506 | 52\% |
| 8 | French | 8,926 |  | 8\% | 8 | Burmese | 798 | 49\% |
| 9 | Korean | 7,135 |  | 42\% | 9 | Thai | 1,645 | 46\% |
| 10 | Hindi | 5,763 |  | 17\% | 10 | Russian | 11,026 | 44\% |
| 11 | Japanese | 5,452 |  | 43\% | 11 | Japanese | 5,452 | 43\% |
| 12 | Arabic | 5,073 |  | 33\% | 12 | Korean | 7,135 | 42\% |
| 13 | Filipino | 3,902 |  | 35\% | 13 | Nepali | 567 | 41\% |
| 14 | German | 3,409 |  | 5\% | 14 | Min Nan | 1,138 | 42\% |
| 15 | Italian | 3,067 |  | 7\% | 15 | Mandarin | 14,661 | 38\% |
| 16 | Portuguese | 2,496 |  | 15\% | 16 | Armenian | 1,089 | 37\% |
| 17 | Farsi | 1,873 |  | 26\% | 17 | Tagalog | 18,645 | 36\% |
| 18 | Thai | 1,645 |  | 46\% | 18 | Amharic | 718 | 36\% |
| 19 | Bengali | 1,638 |  | 1\% | 19 | Spanish | 89,292 | 36\% |
| 20 | Hebrew | 1,483 |  | 1\% | 20 | Filipino | 3,902 | 35\% |
| 21 | Gujarati | 1,317 |  | 15\% | 21 | Indonesian | 435 | 34\% |
| 22 | Punjabi | 1,249 |  | 22\% | 22 | Arabic | 5,073 | 33\% |
| 23 | Tamil | 1,186 |  | 18\% | 23 | Lao | 406 | 31\% |
| 24 | Dutch | 1,152 |  | 7\% | 24 | Farsi | 1873 | 26\% |
| 25 | Min Nan | 1,138 |  | 42\% | 25 | Urdu | 836 | 25\% |
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PROJECTED LANGUAGES REQUIRED FOR CRISIS / DISASTER RESPONSE GIVEN 2.5\% AND 5\% THRESHOLDS FOR SAN FRANCISCO DISTRICT POPULATION (2022 5-YEAR AMERICAN COMMUNITY SURVEY VIA OCEIA)

Estimated people with limited English proficiency by Supervisorial District (number and \% of District residents)

|  | District 1 |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Arabic | 161 | $0.2 \%$ |
| Chinese | 8,128 | $10.7 \%$ |
| Filipino | 274 | $0.4 \%$ |
| French | 61 | $0.1 \%$ |
| German | 21 | $0.0 \%$ |
| Korean | 517 | $0.7 \%$ |
| Russian | 1,325 | $1.7 \%$ |
| Spanish | 481 | $0.6 \%$ |
| Vietnamese | 664 | $0.9 \%$ |
|  |  |  |
| Population | 75,727 |  |
|  |  |  |


| District 2 |  |
| ---: | ---: |
| 5 | $0.0 \%$ |
| 768 | $1.0 \%$ |
| 93 | $0.1 \%$ |
| 117 | $0.2 \%$ |
| 8 | $0.0 \%$ |
| 83 | $0.1 \%$ |
| 315 | $0.4 \%$ |
| 614 | $0.8 \%$ |
| 111 | $0.1 \%$ |
| 75,950 |  |


| District 3 |  |
| ---: | ---: |
| 99 | $0.1 \%$ |
| 13,468 | $17.0 \%$ |
| 211 | $0.3 \%$ |
| 64 | $0.1 \%$ |
| 45 | $0.1 \%$ |
| 410 | $0.5 \%$ |
| 524 | $0.7 \%$ |
| 1,118 | $1.4 \%$ |
| 109 | $0.1 \%$ |
|  |  |
| 79,301 |  |


| District 4 |  |
| ---: | ---: |
| 63 | $0.1 \%$ |
| 14,316 | $18.8 \%$ |
| 560 | $0.7 \%$ |
| 214 | $0.3 \%$ |
| 12 | $0.0 \%$ |
| 237 | $0.3 \%$ |
| 416 | $0.5 \%$ |
| 883 | $1.2 \%$ |
| 781 | $1.0 \%$ |
| 75,998 |  |


| District 5 |  |
| ---: | ---: |
| 573 | $0.7 \%$ |
| 3,450 | $4.1 \%$ |
| 1,039 | $1.2 \%$ |
| 179 | $0.2 \%$ |
| 37 | $0.0 \%$ |
| 1,077 | $1.3 \%$ |
| 1,049 | $1.3 \%$ |
| 2,112 | $2.5 \%$ |
| 1,670 | $2.0 \%$ |
|  |  |
| 83,506 |  |


| District 6 |  |
| ---: | ---: |
| 282 | $0.4 \%$ |
| 4,997 | $6.6 \%$ |
| 548 | $0.7 \%$ |
| 99 | $0.1 \%$ |
| 0 | $0.0 \%$ |
| 131 | $0.2 \%$ |
| 177 | $0.2 \%$ |
| 2,297 | $3.0 \%$ |
| 403 | $0.5 \%$ |
| 76,009 |  |


|  | District 7 |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Arabic | 43 | $0.1 \%$ |
| Chinese | 5,938 | $7.5 \%$ |
| Filipino | 399 | $0.5 \%$ |
| French | 13 | $0.0 \%$ |
| German | 27 | $0.0 \%$ |
| Korean | 290 | $0.4 \%$ |
| Russian | 671 | $0.9 \%$ |
| Spanish | 925 | $1.2 \%$ |
| Vietnamese | 529 | $0.7 \%$ |
|  |  |  |
| Population | 78,689 |  |


| District 8 |  |
| ---: | ---: |
| 0 | $0.0 \%$ |
| 812 | $1.0 \%$ |
| 168 | $0.2 \%$ |
| 96 | $0.1 \%$ |
| 61 | $0.1 \%$ |
| 53 | $0.1 \%$ |
| 161 | $0.2 \%$ |
| 1,262 | $1.5 \%$ |
| 175 | $0.2 \%$ |
|  |  |
| 83,420 |  |


| District 9 |  |
| ---: | ---: |
| 4 | $0.0 \%$ |
| 5,280 | $6.5 \%$ |
| 1,047 | $1.3 \%$ |
| 49 | $0.1 \%$ |
| 10 | $0.0 \%$ |
| 26 | $0.0 \%$ |
| 25 | $0.0 \%$ |
| 8,418 | $10.3 \%$ |
| 474 | $0.6 \%$ |
|  |  |
| 81,563 |  |


| District 10 |  |
| ---: | ---: |
| 0 | $0.0 \%$ |
| 12,250 | $14.9 \%$ |
| 951 | $1.2 \%$ |
| 27 | $0.0 \%$ |
| 6 | $0.0 \%$ |
| 111 | $0.1 \%$ |
| 114 | $0.1 \%$ |
| 4,765 | $5.8 \%$ |
| 1,127 | $1.4 \%$ |
|  |  |
| 82,146 |  |


| District 11 |  |  |
| ---: | ---: | :---: |
| 63 | $0.1 \%$ |  |
| 17,464 | $21.1 \%$ |  |
| 2,455 | $3.0 \%$ | Legend |
| 23 | $0.0 \%$ |  |
| 20 | $0.0 \%$ | Meets $5 \%$ of |
| 76 | $0.1 \%$ |  |
| 90 | $0.1 \%$ | District threshold |
| 6,785 | $8.2 \%$ | Meets $2.5 \%$ of |
| 748 | $0.9 \%$ |  |
|  |  |  |
| 82,684 |  |  |

[^1]
## \% of households that are linguistically isolated (no adult in household speaks English "very well")

| Central / South American languages | 53\% |
| :---: | :---: |
| Karen languages | 49\% |
| Mongolian | 44\% |
| Somali | 37\% |
| Dari | 36\% |
| Korean | 32\% |
| Chinese languages | 32\% |
| Oromo | 28\% |
| Ukrainian | 28\% |
| Vietnamese | 28\% |
| Marshallese | 28\% |
| Burmese | 26\% |
| Wolof | 26\% |
| Armenian | 25\% |
| Other Afro-Asiatic languages | 25\% |
| Russian | 25\% |
| Tigrinya | 25\% |
| Thai | 24\% |
| Pashto | 23\% |
| Japanese | 23\% |
| Assyrian Neo-Aramaic | 20\% |
| Gbe languages | 20\% |
| Additional India languages | 20\% |
| Farsi | 20\% |
| Amharic | 20\% |
| Tibetan | 19\% |
| Lao | 19\% |
| Other languages of Asia | 19\% |
| Chaldean Neo-Aramaic | 18\% |
| Khmer | 18\% |
| Indonesian | 18\% |
| Arabic | 18\% |
| Hmong | 17\% |
| Spanish | 16\% |
| Latvian | 16\% |
| Nepali | 16\% |
| Malay | 15\% |
| Ganda | 15\% |
| Manding languages | 15\% |
| Romanian | 15\% |
| Portuguese | 15\% |
| Native North American languages | 15\% |
| Punjabi | 15\% |
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[^0]:    Note: Chart excludes languages where 2021 ACS has estimated there are fewer than 300 speakers in San Francisco.
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